

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 838

UD 028 537

AUTHOR Dottin, Erskine S.
TITLE Humans, Labels, and the Sharing of Experiences: The Struggle for Human Development.
PUB DATE 21 Feb 91
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Minority Affairs Lecture at Louisiana State University (Shreveport, LA, February 21, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Altruism; *Human Relations; *Individual Development; Minority Groups; Racial Bias; Racial Identification; *Racial Relations; Self Actualization
IDENTIFIERS *Humanistic Existentialism

ABSTRACT

Racial relations are considered within a discussion of what constitutes an effective human being. The term "minority status" is dehumanizing as it is currently used and defined. That which is cruel to and destroys other people is labeled "inhumane". A fully functioning person, program, or organization conforms to six evaluative criteria of human effectiveness. An effective human being exhibits certain relationships within and with the external world and is therefore a subject, not an object. This existential need for "self" affirmation is a characteristic common to all human beings. An effective human being acquires personal meaning and understanding of human phenomenon as a fundamental aspect of being educated. Such a person is also educated and developed so as to be what he or she wants to be and to be autonomous. Effective human beings also are responsible as they participate in decisions that affect their lives. Finally, effective human beings share with and care for others as to share with others is not to look out just for self but also to build relationships with others based on mutuality and to contribute to the further development of others. Included are 21 references. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED342838

THE MINORITY AFFAIRS LECTURE

HUMANS, LABELS, AND THE SHARING OF EXPERIENCES:
THE STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT.

by

Ersleine S. Dottin
Associate Professor

Delivered at the Louisiana State University, Shreveport, College of
Education's annual Minority Affairs Lecture. Thursday, February 21, 1991.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Dottin
U. West Florida

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

00 028 637

INTRODUCTION

To the members of the College of Education at LSU, Shreveport, administrators, faculty, staff, students, and guests, may I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the honor you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to share this annual gathering with you. Someone once said that "to tell a story is to distill a human experience and recreate it in a form understandable and enjoyable to others." I trust that my story this evening will be understandable and enjoyable to you.

I think it very salient at this point to apprise you that when Professor Joe Green extended the invitation to me to join you here this evening, he was not cognizant that he was inviting an "Afro-Saxon." I know that you are all saying to yourselves, "what did he say? what an oxymoronic comment!" You see, I was born on the island of Barbados in the Caribbean, and on my first visit to the United States I came across a copy of Jet Magazine in which the author of an article referred to persons like myself as "Afro-Saxons. Titillated by such definitional character, I searched for the author's explication to find that an "Afro-Saxon," is "a person of dark pigmentation from the Caribbean, whose feet are in the West Indies, whose head is in the British Parliament, and whose ass is usually in America."

The famous Roman stoic, Seneca, once remarked that "it is when the gods hate a man with uncommon abhorrence that they drive him into the profession of a schoolmaster." On the other hand, Alfred North Whitehead the British mathematician and philosopher importuned that "it should be the chief aim of a university professor to exhibit himself[herself] in his[her] own true character--that is, an ignorant man[woman] thinking, actively utilizing his[her] small share of knowledge."

The story of human experience I will share with you this evening is not

intended as advice: Socrates was a Greek philosopher who went around giving good advice. They poisoned him. It is not intended to be the conventional 30-45 minutes role model musing in which, according to the columnist for the Washington Post, William Raspberry, successful professionals are asked to spend brief minutes exhorting the "unambitious" or "underprivileged." According to Raspberry, "To the extent that we insist that the role models we foist on ... children be economically successful - particularly the despairing children of the inner cities - we undervalue the men and women in the neighborhood whose attitudes and behavior are so deserving of emulation." (Raspberry, 1990: 23A) On the other hand, the human experience I share with you this evening may "gall the orthodox and annoy the complacent." If so, then you will be the best judge of its effectiveness.

As professors and students, I am sure that you are well aware of the need for definitional clarity in any lecture. Since I am persuaded by the dictum of Stokeley Carmichael that "he who sets the definition is in power," may I announce that the present definitional use of the term "minority status" is dehumanizing. According to Ornstein (1978): "The term 'minority status' is used to designate the standing of those members of society who are prevented from participating fully and equally in all phases of social life, who are subordinate to the majority, who can be distinguished on the basis of physical or cultural characteristics, and who have fewer life chances and rights than the majority." Wagley and Harris (1958) given such a definition, draw the following characteristics of "a minority:"

1. Minorities are subordinate segments of a complex society.
2. Minorities have special physical or cultural traits which
(distinguish them from the majority group, and often) are seen as undersirable (as well).
3. Minorities have a group self-awareness brought about by the special traits they share and the special disabilities these traits cause them.

4. Membership in a minority is transmitted by a rule of descent - one is born in a minority - and this rule of descent is capable of imposing the minority status on future generations, even if by then the special physical or cultural trait of the minority has disappeared.
5. Members of a minority, whether by choice or by necessity, tend to practice endogamy - that is, to marry within the group.

I am in the human business of teaching at the University of West Florida in Pensacola, Florida. I have on several occasions, without prior notice or explanation, asked those persons in my classes who were "minorities" to stand up. Invariably, persons in the groups who had dark pigmentations would stand up. I would follow that request by asking that all "majority" persons stand. Invariably, no one would stand. I should point out that the ethnic composition of my classes is usually about 0.4 to 1% of persons with dark pigmentation. Since it has been said that the mark of an educated person is not his/her ability to answer questions, but his/her ability to raise proper questions, permit me license in drawing on the popular culture of the media through Andy Rooney of the "Sixty Minutes" program, and ask, "have you ever wondered why such would be the outcome in the foregoing scenario?"

To distill our human experience presupposes some understanding of the inherent qualities that make us human. I would like to offer you the proposition that it is the way we interact with other people that makes us human. Conversely, I am suggesting that it is the cruelty to and the destruction of other people that we label inhumane.

Against that backdrop, I am going to spend the remainder of my presentation imploring you to judge your human effectiveness, not through sociological and anthropological labels and categories, but instead through six evaluative criteria

that may be used to judge the fully functioning person, program, organization, and so on.

THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

The Maslowian needs hierarchy is a useful framework for me to use to juxtapose my evaluative criteria. While Maslow's hierarchy moves from biological needs to psychological states of self-actualization, the evaluative criteria I am using reflect a humanistic propensity for the effectiveness of "self," human effectiveness.

Alvin Mahrer, the humanistic psychologist at the University of Ottawa, suggests that human beings are basically and fundamentally events in time and space. According to Mahrer, we use descriptive constructs (sociological, psychological, political, and so on) as ways of trying to make sense of events by conceptualizing about them. In other words, theoretical constructs supposedly guide us toward our better describing the event; they are not the events described. Mahrer contends that when we ascribe to events as basically matter on the one hand (physical, bodily, etc.) and soul on the other (psychic, mental, etc.) we create "theorogenic problems." (Mahrer, 1978)

Humanistic theory therefore assumes that the human being is "... a single, unitary thing, with only a single kind of event, stuff, or substance at its base." (Mahrer, 1978: 142) The effective human being thus exhibits certain relationships within (his/her potentials for experiencing) and with the external world. The effective human being is therefore committed to being a subject and not an object (Being Who he/she is); acquiring personal meaning of life (Learning from inside-out); being what he/she wants to be (Being Autonomous); participating in decisions that affect his/her life (Being Responsible); sharing with others (Cooperative); and caring for others (Having a Sense of Community).

Human effectiveness is not, consequently, just a matter of possessing certain

skills nor of being possessed by skills either. It is easy to hide behind skills and avoid relating to people. Human effectiveness is the affective use of the individual's own self: combining his/her own knowledge and sensitivity with his/her own unique ways of putting it into operation so as to be helpful to others. As Guy Claxton, the British psychologist puts it, "Learning to be a human is therefore not just learning a job - it is learning a new way of being yourself."

May I importune you, especially at this time in human development, to place a premium on a simple realization that "the place to improve the world is first in one's own heart and head and hands and then work outward from there."

CRITERION ONE/BEING A SUBJECT

Marilyn Fergusson, author of THE AQUARIAN CONSPIRACY: PERSONAL AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN THE 80'S contends that "... every human being wants to feel there is some inner and deeper meaning to his [her] existence than just being and consuming and once he [she] begins to feel that way he wants his [her] social organization to correspond to that feeling." This existential need for "self" affirmation is a characteristic common to all human beings. However, to affirm one's true "self" in relation to other "selves" is contingent upon what Martin Buber refers to as "I-Thou Relationships." In other words, I must be treated as a subject and not an object by the other, and, conversely, I must not objectify the other. It is these interpersonal relationships that for the late Jean-Paul Sartre are "... a perpetual struggle to assert the fluidity of our own existence against persistent attempts to objectify us by others." Persons who have not been allowed to experience themselves as continuously related to the world by moral action, may split themselves into two systems, a system of false selves presented as a mask to the world, and an inner self of authentic experience not revealed to others. This torment by mutual objectification is captured by

Sartre in his play NO EXIT as a world where "hell is other people."

We have been constantly warned about the deleterious nature of this tormented form of human existence, vis-a-vis, divided selves. For example, Ewens (1986) posits that: "Through spontaneous activities, persons both realize their own self-potentials [their real selves] and straightforwardly relate themselves to the outside world [their public selves]." (Ewens, 1986: 26) However, incongruity and/or disintegrative relationships between the real self and the public self enhances the creation of basic insecurity on the part of the individual, the abandonment of the real self, and in extreme cases the divided public/private character of an accomplished fake. (Ewens, 1986) For Ewens, "... social environments that constrain human development [facilitate the private/public self disintegrated duality] tend to be characterized by authoritarian relationships, while, ... social environments that facilitate human development [enhance private/public self integration and congruency] tend to be characterized by democratic relationships." (Ewens, 1986: 23)

Oppressive social conditions and environments in any society whether in areas of economic production, government, schooling, child rearing, relations between Caucasians and Negroes, relations between adults and children, and relations between men and women, thus foster this pervasive personality split between the real self and the public self. (Ewens, 1986) Someone once said that "any black person in America who is not paranoid is sick."

The psychiatrist, Frantz Fanon, has vividly and experientially described this personality dilemma in his 1967 book, BLACK SKIN, WHITE MASKS. In it he highlights the basic dilemma of the colonized African Antillean culture confronted with the French colonizers self affirming reality of turn white or disappear.

Paulo Friere, the noted Brazilian educator and philosopher, has also shed light on the dilemma this time for Brazilian peasants whose illiteracy was being shaped by a pedagogy of the oppressed. (Friere, 1970).

The now defunct, Martin Luther King, drew attention to the dilemma for African-Americans in his work entitled, WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? (King, 1968). For Dr. King, racism is a product of mind-body dualism or simply put a private versus public self split. To him, as explained by Charles Hampden-Turner:

Whites employ an extremist, Bible-belt fundamentalism to extol a mind that represses the body, a souless power that brutalizes powerless souls and a coercive discipline of blind loyalty to the white race. At the same time, they project upon blacks the repressed and rejected halves of their own values [selves], so that blacks are alleged to possess animal bodies, smouldering with passion for Pure Southern Womanhood, other-worldly 'souls' of escapist religions and dangerously dissentient appetites. (Hampden-Turner, 1981: 204)

Affirming self for African-Americans under the foregoing interpersonal relationships induces as Fanon (1967) puts it "...[a] constant effort to run away from his own individuality, to annihilate his own presence." (Fanon, 1967: 60)

Listen to the damning cries of some who have wrestled wrenchingly with this dilemma of duality of consciousness. First W.E.B. DuBois:

It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels this twoness--an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, who dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn assunder. (DuBois, 1970: 3)

Next, let us hear Ralph Ellison:

I am an invisible man. No, I am not a spook like those who haunted Edgar Allan Poe; nor am I one of your Hollywood ectoplasms. I am a man of substance, of flesh and bone, fiber and liquids, and I might even be

said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard distorting glass. When they approach me they see only my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination--indeed, every thing and anything except me. Nor is my invisibility exactly a matter of biochemical accident to my epidermis. That invisibility to which I refer occurs because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I come into contact. A matter of construction of their inner eyes, those eyes with which they look through their physical eyes upon reality.

(Ellison, 1947: 3)

Are you in the human enterprise of teaching concerned about letting humans be who they are? Are you concerned about you being who you are: a subject and not an object? Dr. Carl Rogers, the humanistic psychologist, writing in the Winter 1987 edition of the educational journal Educational Forum posed a poignant question this way in the title of his article: "Questions I Would Ask Myself If I Were a Teacher." Let me, just as he did, focus on your responsibilities for the learnings of children. As teachers and or related professionals, shouldn't a vital question for you be: Am I promoting self-definition for myself and other humans by enhancing my intrinsic worth as well as that of others? Do I use labels and categories to stand for real persons or do I perceive humans to be more than the sum of their parts, categories or labels?

The concept of cultural pluralism in education though, according to Nicholas Appleton (1983), "plagued with ambiguity, generality, and confusion," is enslaving us to group identification rather than self-definition. Orlando Patterson (1975) has argued that a spurious philosophy of pluralism and ethnicity endanger individuality and personal autonomy and increase our tendency to perceive humans in need of group and cultural identity and/or in terms of tribal blocks. For

Patterson, the use of these pluralistic labels and categories presents (a) the opportunity for a patronizing form of "cultural relativism" that may reinforce existing inequalities in society; (b) the opportunity to attach ability, capacity, and behavior to immutable biological determinants through the concept of "race" and thereby justify differential treatment of certain groups; and (c) the opportunity for increasing conformity to group norms as ethnic cohesiveness implies individual conformity to group norms and ideals. (Patterson, 1975)

The call for human interpersonal relationships that therefore enhance persons being subjects rather than objects have come from many corners, and individuals, but none more poignant than the late Dr. Martin Luther King who in his memorable "I Have a Dream" speech importuned us to embrace and move toward an open democratic society where free association for individuals being at its highest precipitates a move away from individual identity and group membership being defined inexorably in ethnic terms.

INSIDE-OUT LEARNING

One of my favorite authors, J. Krishnamurti, raises a very critical educational concern in his book, THINK ON THESE THINGS. He asks: "Why do we go to school, why do we learn various subjects, why do we pass examinations and compete with each other for better grades? What does this so-called education mean, and what is it all about? (1970: 9). Like Krishnamurti, I think this should be a critical concern " not only for students, but also for parents, for the teachers and for everyone who loves this earth." (Krishnamurti, 1970: 9)

Krishnamurti (1970) finds the purpose of education to be meaningless unless it, according to him, helps one "... to understand the vast expanse of life with all its subtleties, with its extraordinary beauty, its sorrows and joys." (p. 9) My pedagogical experience leads me to conclude that there are many in the U.S.A. who see education from an outside-in perspective. In this sense, learning is a function of the need from the point of view of an outsider: the dispensing of

information becomes the pedagogical end. Education from an inside-out mode seeks to help persons discover the personal meaning of information they receive for their lives so that they might behave differently as a result. If education is seen as enhancing the acquisition of personal meaning, then a logical outcome of education should be to cultivate in us the intelligence to try and find the answers to life's problems.

Of course, to some, the term intelligence immediately conjures up the California Stanford-Binet formula of MA over CA times 100 equals intelligence quotient. But suppose, like Krishnamurti, we perceive intelligence as the "capacity ... to think freely without fear, without a formula, so that you begin to discover for yourself what is real, what is true," then any atmosphere or environment that induces fear is antithetical to the cultivation of this form of intelligence, that is, this form of education.

Education whose aim is antithetical to the cultivation of this form of intelligence thus would seem not intended to produce literacy for freedom (Bowers, 1974; Greene, 1982) in the masess, i.e., education for consciousness, but instead would seem to be a form of what Paulo Friere calls "pedagogy of the oppressed," and what Joel Spring calls "the sorting machine." Social existence and social reality in this context become a form of what Jean-Paul Sartre calls "bad faith." Should education under these circumstances enhance individuals conforming to the pattern of such a rotten social reality? Or should education provide one with freedom, complete freedom to grow and create a different society?

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1967), American sociologists, contend that social relations are to a large degree controlled by social structures or social orders. They further posit that an individual comes to know self through a social consciousness which is shaped by the norms, values, beliefs and expectations of the social order. When these norms, beliefs, and so on, of the social structures are taken for granted and not examined, then individual selves may be merely a

reflection of the social order and social definition, rather than individual authentic selves.

Does the schooling enterprise or education order, be it teacher education, facilitate this taken-for-granted world view by inducing one to conform to the pattern of the status quo through its norms, values, curricular content, social structure and the production and consumption knowledge process? The person who simply conforms, who follows things the way they are, does not constantly inquire, does not constantly observe, does not constantly learn, i.e., acquire personal meaning, therefore is not constantly aware, and thus may not constantly be educated. (Krishnamurti, 1970)

Let us listen to James Baldwin bring to life the connection between being educated and the acquisition of personal meaning, that is, learning from inside-out:

The paradox of education is precisely this--that as one begins to become conscious one begins to examine the society in which he is being educated. The purpose of education, finally, is to create in a person the ability to look at the world for himself, to make his own decisions, to say to himself this is black or this is white, to decide for himself whether there is a God in heaven or not. To ask questions of the universe, and then learn to live with those questions, is the way he achieves his own identity. But no society is really anxious to have that kind of person around. What societies really, ideally, want is a citizenry which will simply obey the rules of society. If a society succeeds in this, that society is about to perish. The obligations of anyone who thinks of himself as responsible is to examine society and try to change it and to fight it -- at no matter what risk. This is the only hope society has. This is the only way societies change. (Baldwin, 1988)

Baldwin goes on to suggest that:

... any Negro who is born in this country and undergoes the American educational system runs the risk of becoming schizophrenic. On the one hand he is born in the shadow of the stars and stripes and he is assured it represents a nation which has never lost a war. He pledges allegiance to that flag which guarantees 'liberty and justice for all.' He is part of a country in which anyone can become president, and so forth. But on the other hand he is also assured by his country and his countrymen that he has never contributed anything to civilization -- that his past is nothing more than a record of humiliations gladly endured. He is assumed by the republic that he, his father, his mother, and his ancestors were happy, shiftless, watermelon-eating darkies who loved Mr. Charlie and Miss Ann, that the value he has as a black man is proven by one thing only -- his devotion to white people. (Baldwin, 1988: 4-5)

To be educated in this context, to Baldwin, is not to acquire personal meaning of events, that is, to gain insight into human phenomenon, particularly for the African-American. While his pedagogical solution which he offered in his talk to teachers is not the salient concern here, it is important to note that similar cries for human effectiveness seem imbedded in the cries from Carter G. Woodson, the father of African-American studies, in his seminal work, THE MIS-EDUCATION OF THE NERGRO: "when you control a man's thinking you do not have to worry about his actions."

BEING WHAT I WANT TO BE

The basis of a human community is the free association of autonomous individuals. Until persons are free, and accept their responsibility, all attempts at a human community are foredoomed. Julius Nyerere, the notable African leader has noted that "development means freedom and liberation. Development means people. But, ... people cannot be developed, human beings can only develop

themselves."

If human beings can only develop themselves, then autonomy is the prerequisite of freedom, and from it springs independence and self-reliance, and without it liberty is impossible. Autonomy means freedom to learn rather than to be taught. The late British statesman, Sir Winston Churchill once commented that "he was always willing to learn, but not always willing to be taught."

Autonomy should not be reserved simply for those we selectively choose. For example, I recently received a memorandum at my university in which faculty were being offered the opportunity to work with the honor students. A part of the memo read as follows: "... Honors students like interdisciplinary approaches to interesting topics. It is characteristic of Honors students that they want to participate in their own education: no straight lectures, please, but ... lab or field work, some original documents, in-class reports by individuals or teams, write and stage a play, and so on. Teaching Honors students can give your batteries a re-charge and give you a chance to experiment."

I usually read this to my classes, and inquire of all those who are not in the honors program to identify the underlying assumption being made about them and their learning ability.

Do we similarly restrict the autonomy of individuals when we tend to see them not as unique, autonomous human beings, but rather in terms of segregated tribal, ethnic blocks? Just as equal opportunity vis-a-vis learning may be restricted in the foregoing honor students scenario, it may just as well be restricted when use a spurious concept of "race," and thereby encourage people to view one another as members of so-called racial groups. Race as a label for biological characteristics, a measure which Ashley Montagu, the eminent anthropologist calls "man's most dangerous myth," encourages some people to attach ability, capacity, and behavior to immutable biological determinants for other people, and thereby justify differential treatment. The literature is replete with evidence ranging

from biblical justification to social Darwinism to school segregation to affirmative action.

Successful teaching succeeds by doing itself out of a job. It succeeds by becoming unnecessary, by producing an individual who no longer needs to be taught, who breaks loose and swings free of the teacher and becomes self-moving. Is there any possibility for John Dewey's theory of school as community or as expressed by foundations of education scholar, Richard Pratte, "dynamic pluralism" in society? Can we have autonomous human beings who exist in a democratic society which affords room for many competing interests? Can we have a diverse society that is maintained by the constant forming of interest communities, where group membership is voluntary, and loyalties and commitments are chosen and not ascribed? Can your pedagogical "house of intellect" assist in helping all human beings to develop themselves, that is, to be autonomous?

BEING RESPONSIBLE

Authors of the book RAISING SELF-RELIANT CHILDREN IN A SELF-INDULGENT WORLD: SEVEN BUILDING BLOCKS FOR DEVELOPING CAPABLE YOUNG PEOPLE, H. Stephen Glenn and Jane Nelsen, contend that from the cradle to about the twentieth year of life, most children in America are tacitly told to keep their mouths shut, to stay out of difficulty, make good grades, do what adults tell them, and appreciate what adults do for them. They are not really made to feel that they are absolutely critical to the survival of the [American] family, that they are needed, and that adults could not accomplish what they do without their participation. These conditions argue Glenn and Nelsen induce a form passivity among young people. (Glenn & Nelsen. 1989: 40-41)

It seems that one can make a very striking analogy between Glenn & Nelsen's scenario vis-a-vis the development of young people, and what David Mura in his article entitled "Strangers in the Village," refers to as "fundamental historical events," in America: the enslavement of Africans-Americans by European-Americans;

the taking of the American continent by Europeans from native Americans and the accompanying policies of genocide; the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II; the Asian-Exclusion Act; the conditions of Asian workers building the American railroads; the conditions of migrant farm workers; and illegal aliens. (Mura, 1988)

As in the case of Glenn and Nelsen's scenario regarding the development of the young, the work and lives of the humans involved in Mura's historical events represent the passive fulfillment of someone else's plans or ideas. The significance of the lives of those involved simply lie in acquiescing to the demands and wishes of others, and consequently, just as in the case of children, there is little tolerance in the American culture for their specialness.

A famous philosopher once said that "no man is free who is not master of himself." Responsibility implies that humans are accountable for their actions, and through their actions, they determine their fates. On the other hand, authoritarian environments deprive humans of responsibility, that is, the ability to participate fully in decisions that affect their lives, and as a result, proclaim humans as the products of mysterious forces beyond their control. Such procrustean climates teach that society and environment shape the lives of individuals, that rather than doing, they are done to, and that self-improvement is a foolish dream. There is, therefore, a direct correlation between freedom and responsibility. Environments that induce passivity are antithetical to freedom.

Since the need to have meaning in one's life, and to be treated responsibly seem imbedded in the human psyche, should we glean any insight from the horrendous data on teenage pregnancies, especially as Glenn and Nelsen point out that as soon as an adolescent becomes a mother, she is treated as a woman rather than as the child she still is. Glenn and Nelsen, insist that adolescent sexuality has increasingly been shown to be a strategy young people use to make themselves significant, i.e., responsible, at least temporarily, in the eyes of someone else.

(Glenn & Nelsen, 1989)

Do we find the literature replete with examples of the people outlined in Mura's "fundamental historical events" in America utilizing different means and strategies to acquire meaningful roles and a sense of responsibility given their oppressed conditions?

Mura cautions, however, that in order for persons to fully participate in decisions that affect their lives, that is, be free, be they the oppressed or the oppressor, they must be cognizant that "Reality is not simply knowing who we think we are, but also what others think of us." (Mura, 1988:152) Accordingly, Mura goes on to suggest that "In the realm of culture in America, white European culture has held the floor for centuries; just as with any one-sided conversation, a balance can only be achieved if the speaker who has dominated speaks less and listen more." (Mura, 1988: 152) For the oppressed to have meaningful roles there must be realization and recognition of some of the following:

American culture defines white middle-class culture as the norm. As a result, Blacks and other [ethnic groups], must generally know two cultures to survive - the culture of middle-class whites and their own [ethnic] culture. Middle-class whites need only ... know one culture. For them, knowledge of a [so-called minority] culture is a seeming -- and I use the word 'seeming' here purposely -- luxury; they can survive without it. (Mura, 1988: 137)

... [equating] the issue of race with prejudice against women or Italians or rich people. Such generalizations can sometimes be used to express sympathy with victims of prejudice, but as used by many whites, it generally attempts to shut down racial anger by denying the distinct causes of that anger, thereby rendering it meaningless. (Mura, 1988: 137)

That rage [is] liberating ... for any oppressed people.... those who are oppressed cannot change their situation, cannot own themselves, unless they finally own their rage at their condition and those who have caused it....

... one must learn first how liberating anger feels, then how intoxicating, then how damaging, and in each of these stages, the reason for these feelings must be admitted and accurately described. (Mura, 1988: 148-149)

The wish for superiority is simply the reverse side of feeling inferior, not its cure. (Mura, 1988: 149)

The superior economic and political power of whites as compared to [other ethnic groups] in this country is a fact, and on some level, every white in this country benefits from that power. Of course, this does not mean that every white has more economic and political power than every member of [the other ethnic groups]. But it is not just this inequality of power that makes collective white guilt a fact; it is the way that power was acquired and the way its sources have been kept hidden from the consciousness of both whites and [other ethnic groups] that makes this term [collective white guilt] applicable. (Mura, 1988: 150-151)

When [whites] accept the concept of collective guilt, they admit that they feel unjustifiable anger and resentment at any measure that threatens any part of their privileged position, much less any of the measures that approach just compensation. When whites don't admit collective guilt, they try to blame racial troubles on those who ask for

a just settlement and remain baffled at the anger and resentment of the [other ethnic groups]. (Mura, 1988: 151-152)

I cannot participate fully in decisions that affect my life as a human being if those who are in power are unwilling to give up any power and/or attempt to make things equal. As put by Martin Luther King, Jr.:

The absence of freedom imposes restraint on my deliberations as to what I shall do, where I shall live or the kind of task I shall pursue. I am robbed of the basic quality of manness. When I cannot choose what I shall do or where I shall live, it means in fact that someone or some system has already made these decisions for me, and I am reduced to an animal. Then the only resemblance I have to a man is in my motor responses and functions. I cannot adequately assume responsibility as a person because I have been made the victim of a decision in which I played no part. (King, 1968: 99)

CARING FOR AND SHARING WITH OTHERS

Why do some of us feel concern about what happens to people beyond our immediate families and others of us do not? Is this feeling of concern about another person's welfare even though remotely distant from us a measure of our higher order concern for ourselves? These are questions we need to ask ourselves as human beings when we contemplate being a whole person with a sense of responsibility, and desire to acquire personal meaning in our lives with a degree of self-determination in choosing the manner in which we decide to share our lives and personal resources with other human beings who cohabit this planetary ecosystem called earth.

Glenn and Nelsen (1989) point out that one of the salient problems likely to arise among young people is a lack of access to support groups. Their solution to the problem is the creation of networks which they define in the simplest sense as two or more individuals who engage in dialogue about the world and the life they

are living and who occasionally collaborate to achieve some mutually desirable end. (Glenn & Nelsen, 1989: 36)

If one shifts the focus from the young to group relations in America, one finds a similar lack of networking. Racism fosters the kind of social environment in which individuals from certain ethnic groups do not feel listened to, taken seriously or significant as persons. Human development is severely inhibited when the individual does not have a sense of connection, a sense of community.

On the other hand, racism and classism foster a sense of community as being a place where people reside. However, a community is not merely a place where people reside. Rather community implies commonality, gregariousness, and shared enjoyment which facilitates the exchange of experience. The major ingredient in the feeling of community is friendship.

Friendships can only be fostered in environments in which a high value is placed on the individuality of all ethnic group members, and on the relationships that exist within and among those ethnic groups and members. When this is done individuals, regardless of ethnic background, learn that others care for them, and are not simply interested in taking care of them as some in the teaching profession are wont to do vis-a-vis their charges. To care for someone is to love someone, and as Erich Fromm reminds us: "Loving is unified separateness. We can love others as equals only because they are different from us, not because they are the same. Equality is the balancing of differentiations and integration by which we grow." (Hampden-Turner, 1981: 50)

In fact, Fromm insists that "Loving contains four elements, care, responsibility, respect and knowledge: care is an active concern for the life and growth of the other; responsibility the desire (not duty) to respond to the other's needs; respect, from respicere 'to look at', is to recognize the other's uniqueness; knowledge combines objective knowing with that which is revealed through participation and intimate identification." (Hampden-Turner, 1981: 50)

Wayne Dyer, author of Your Erroneous Zones, warn that "People who are victimized by institutions are very often devotees of competition at all costs. They have learned to deify the sacred 'competitive spirit', and they attempt to impose the holy neurosis of competition on everyone they encounter." But we have come to recognize that the better way for people as a whole on a planet of dwindling resources is to share through cooperative ventures rather than compete through gluttonous self-interest ventures. If this is true on a global basis, how much more is it true in our personal lives on a local basis? As humans invest themselves in collaborative group approaches, they develop a firmer sense of their own identity. Human problems identified and delineated through cooperative interaction appear to challenge people to produce creative solutions, and to become more creative individuals.

To share with others is thus not to look out just for self. It is to build relationships with others based on mutuality, to recognize the strengths and contributions of others, and to contribute to the further development of others.

At this point in my presentation, you are probably thinking that I am like the little girl who said she knew how to spell banana but she did not know when to stop. I going to be like the fat man who said when he crawled through the barbed wire fence, "One more point and I'm through."

I have tried to offer you a passport to personal growth in which there are six humanistic goals that correlate highly with human effectiveness and development. I have tried to have you admit to yourself the degree to which you are developing along the six dimensions. My major thrust has been to remind you that all humans regardless of pigmentation have gifts and as David Myers' commentary in EDUCATION WEEK, January 16, 1991, indicate: "... there are hidden costs to labeling children [and might I add persons] as winners and losers, gifted and ungifted [and again might I add minority and majority]. According to Myers (1991) "Such labels can create their own reality. In experiments, labeling people

as hostile, outgoing, or brilliant induces others to treat them in ways that elicit hostility, outgoingness, or apparent brilliance. Labels may be fables, but even fables can be self-fulfilling." (p. 36)

I trust that I have provoked you to ask the kinds of questions that Carl Rogers contend facilitate mutual human understanding: "Can I care, ... while still allowing the other to be separate? Can I leave the comfortable, familiar structures of my own self and enter the unfamiliar territory of another, knowing that I may never be the same, that from another viewpoint I could appear wholly deficient? Have I the strength not to be destroyed by his[her] anger, frightened by his[her] anguish, engulfed by his[her] dependence, while accepting the integrity of both our points of view? Can I tread, sensitively and intelligently on the precious mental 'furniture' of another?" (Hampden-Turner, 1981: 116)

After hearing an address on education entitled, "First Teach Them to Read," Martin Luther King, Jr. leaned over to a friend and said, "First teach them to believe in themselves." As stated by David Myers (1991) Dr. King is reported to have retorted: "By encouraging all children to believe in themselves--to define and develop their gifts--we keep faith with our democratic ideals while strengthening our creativity as a society." (p.36)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

RESOURCES

- Appleton, N. (1983) Cultural pluralism in education: Theoretical foundations. New York: Longman.
- Baldwin, J. (1988) A talk to teachers in Multi-cultural literacy edited by Rick Simonson & Scott Walker. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1967) The social construction of reality. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bowers, C.A. (1974) Cultural literacy for freedom: An existential perspective on teaching, curriculum and school policy. Oregon: Elan Publishers.
- DuBois, W.E.B. (1970) The souls of black folk. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Ellison, R. (1947) Invisible man. New York: Random House.
- Ewens, W.L. (1986) Becoming free: The struggle for human development. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources.
- Fanon, F. (1967) Black skin, white masks. New York: Grove Press.
- Friere, P. (1970) Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.
- Glenn, H.S. & Nelsen, J. (1989) Raising self-reliant children in a self-indulgent world. Rocklin, CA: Prima Publishing & Communications.
- Greene, M. (1982, January) Literacy for what? Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (5), 326-329.
- Hampden-Turner, C. (1981) Maps of the mind. New York: Collier Books.
- King, Jr., M.L. (1968) Where do we go from here: Chaos or community. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1970) Think on these things. New York: Perennial Library.
- Mahrer, A. (1978) Experiencing: A humanistic theory of psychology and psychiatry. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.
- Mura, D. (1988) Strangers in the village in Multi-cultural literacy edited by Rick Simonson & Scott Walker. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.

- Myers, D.G. (1991, January 16) Don't all children have gifts? Education Week, X (17), p. 36.
- Ornstein, A.C. (1978) Education and social inquiry. Itasca, ILL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Patterson, O. (1975) Ethnicity and the pluralistic fallacy. Change, March.
- Raspberry, W. (1990, December 25) Role models for our children need to be ordinary good people they know. Pensacola News Journal, p. 23A.
- Wagley, C. & Harris, M. (1958) Minorities in the new world. New York: Columbia University Press.